Gravitational Wave Oscillations in Bigravity

Kevin Max,[1] Moritz Platscher,[2] and Juri Smirnov[3]

[1] *Scuola Normale Superiore, Piazza dei Cavalieri, 7 - 56126 Pisa, Italy*
[2] *Max-Planck-Institut für Kernphysik, Saupfercheckweg 1, 69117 Heidelberg, Germany*
[3] *INFN divisione di Firenze, Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Firenze, Via Sansone 1, 50019 Sesto Fiorentino, Florence, Italy*

arXiv:1703.07785v1 [gr-qc] 22 Mar 2017

ABSTRACT

We derive consistent equations for gravitational wave oscillations in bigravity. In this framework a second dynamical tensor field is introduced in addition to General Relativity and coupled such that one massless and one massive linear combination arise. Only one of the two tensors is the physical metric coupling to matter, and thus the basis in which gravitational waves propagate is different from the basis where the wave is produced and detected. Therefore, one should expect – in analogy to neutrino oscillations – to observe an oscillatory behavior. We show how this behavior arises explicitly, discuss phenomenological implications and present new limits on the graviton parameter space in bigravity.

I. INTRODUCTION

The question whether a theory of a massless spin two particle can have a consistent massive extension was a longstanding open problem. After the realization that only a very particular combination of fields for the mass term is allowed [1, 2], it was discovered that the theory of massive gravity seemed to posses no consistent zero mass limit, known as the vDVZ-discontinouity [3, 4]. This problem was resolved by Vainshtein who realized the importance of the non-linear interactions of the theory and showed that an effective General Relativity limit is possible [5]. The next realization was that a generic massive theory of a spin two particle suffers from a ghost state [6]. Finally, it has recently been proven that a consistent framework of massive gravity exists and relies on the existence of multiple spin two fields with non-linear interactions [7–15].

We will refer to this framework as *bigravity* for the sake of concreteness and study a setup with two dynamical spin two fields corresponding to two metrics [16, 17]. The coupling of the metrics to matter is a delicate problem and as has been discussed in [18], as an arbitrary choice of coupling reintroduces the aforementioned Boulware-Deser ghost. Demanding the absence of a ghost in the theory translates into an asymmetric coupling of the metrics to matter, and this asymmetry is at the core of the physical phenomenon we will discuss in this letter. The simplest choice of matter coupling which permits a ghost-free theory is minimal coupling of one metric tensor to matter, which we will call the physical metric and no coupling of the second metric tensor to matter. This second metric tensor is a reference or sterile metric which only interacts with the physical metric via the non-linear terms in the Lagrangian. This situation is analogous to the introduction of a sterile neutrino which carries no electroweak charges.

Linearizing this theory and rotating to the mass basis shows that the gravitational interactions are mediated by two gravitons, one massless and one massive. Since the two are superpositions of the physical and the sterile metric, their effective coupling to matter is different and depends on the mixing angle between the metrics. In this work we will study the propagation of gravitational waves (GW) in this bi-metric theory which are produced in the 'flavor basis' at the source, namely only as perturbations of the physical metric. Describing the wave propagation we find a close analogy to neutrino oscillation described in the wave-packet formalism.

This phenomenon is presented for the first time in a consistent approach. Attempts have been previously made in Refs. [19, 20], however only in a specific setting, and leading to an unphysical result, in particular it was concluded that one graviton mode exhibits superluminal propagation. We find no such behavior, as one should expect in a healthy theory. Furthermore, direct detection data of GW signals by the LIGO experiment [21] have now been confronted with the oscillation hypothesis in this work for the first time.

This letter is structured as follows. In Sec. II we review some basic facts of bi-metric gravity. The main results are presented in Sec. III, where we discuss the background Friedmann-Robertson-Walker (FRW)-like cosmology (III A), the phenomenon of GW oscillations (III B), and finally study the phenomenological implications (III C). We summarize our findings in Sec. IV.

II. BI-METRIC GRAVITY

The full nonlinearly gauge invariant, ghost-free action of two dynamical metrics is [22],

$$S_{\rm Bi} = \frac{M_g^2}{2}\int d^4x\sqrt{-\det g}\; R(g) + \frac{M_{\tilde g}^2}{2}\int d^4x\sqrt{-\det \tilde g}\; \tilde R(\tilde g) + \\ + m^2 M_{\rm eff}^2 \int d^4x\sqrt{-\det g}\sum_{n=0}^{4}\beta_n e_n(\sqrt{g^{-1}\tilde g}) + \int d^4x\sqrt{-\det g}\;\mathcal{L}_{\rm matter}\,, \tag{1}$$

with M_g ($M_{\tilde g}$) the Planck mass of the physical (reference) metric g ($\tilde g$) and $M_{\rm eff}^{-2} = \left(M_g^{-2} + M_{\tilde g}^{-2}\right)$. $R(g)$ and $\tilde R(\tilde g)$ denote the corresponding Ricci scalars. The terms in the potential are given by the constants β_n and the functions $e_n(\sqrt{g^{-1}\tilde g}) \equiv e_n(\mathbb{X})$, which are polynomials of the quantity $\mathbb{X}$,

$$e_0(\mathbb{X}) = 1\;\; e_1(\mathbb{X}) = [\mathbb{X}]\,,\; e_2(\mathbb{X}) = \frac{1}{2}\left([\mathbb{X}]^2 - \left[\mathbb{X}^2\right]\right)\,, \\ e_3(\mathbb{X}) = \frac{1}{6}\left([\mathbb{X}]^3 - 3\,[\mathbb{X}]\left[\mathbb{X}^2\right] + 2\left[\mathbb{X}^3\right]\right)\,, \\ e_4(\mathbb{X}) = \det \mathbb{X}\,. \tag{2}$$

Note that the term involving $e_0(\mathbb{X})$ is nothing but a cosmological constant.

III. GRAVITATIONAL WAVE OSCILLATIONS IN FRW COSMOLOGIES

In this model, the oscillation of metric perturbations is driven by classical dynamics of the Friedmann equations [19]. They are extracted from the Einstein field equations derived from Eq. (1),

$$R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}R + B_{\mu\nu}(g) = \frac{8\pi}{M_g^2}T_{\mu\nu}\,, \tag{3a}$$

$$\tilde R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}\tilde g_{\mu\nu}\tilde R + \tilde B_{\mu\nu}(\tilde g) = 0\,, \tag{3b}$$

where $\cos^2(\theta) = \frac{M_{\rm eff}^2}{M_g^2}$, $\sin^2(\theta) = \frac{M_{\rm eff}^2}{M_{\tilde g}^2}$ and,

$$B_{\mu\nu}(g) = m^2\cos^2(\theta)\sum_{n=0}^{3}\beta_n V_{\mu\nu}^{(n)}\,, \tag{4}$$

$$\tilde B_{\mu\nu}(\tilde g) = m^2\sin^2(\theta)\sum_{n=1}^{4}\sqrt{g^{-1}\tilde g}\,\beta_n\tilde V_{\mu\nu}^{(n)}. \tag{5}$$

The $V_{\mu\nu}^{(n)}$, $\tilde V_{\mu\nu}^{(n)}$ encode the variation of the interaction terms in the action, $e_n(\mathbb{X})$, w.r.t. $g, \tilde g$. For example, we find $V_{\mu\nu}^{(0)}(g) = g_{\mu\nu}$. Furthermore, by applying the covariant derivatives to Eqs. (3), we obtain the conservation laws,

$$\nabla_\mu B^\mu{}_\nu = 0, \qquad \tilde\nabla_\mu \tilde B^\mu{}_\nu = 0, \qquad \nabla_\mu T^\mu{}_\nu = 0, \tag{6}$$

the first two of which are known as Bianchi constraints.

A. Background cosmology

We proceed to calculate the cosmological implications on a static background, following the approach of [19]. For both g and $\tilde g$, we assume as background the FRW metric with conformal time η,[1]

$$\begin{aligned} {\rm d}s^2 &= a(\eta)^2(-{\rm d}\eta^2 + {\rm d}\vec x^2)\,, \\ {\rm d}\tilde s^2 &= b(\eta)^2(-\tilde c(\eta)^2\,{\rm d}\eta^2 + {\rm d}\vec x^2)\,, \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where ${\rm d}\vec x = \frac{{\rm d}r^2}{1-\kappa r^2} + r^2({\rm d}\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta{\rm d}\phi^2)$. The function $\tilde c(\eta)$ determines the light cone for the second metric and will play a role for the propagation speed of the massive gravitational wave excitations.

Plugging this ansatz into Eqs. (3) and omitting explicit dependencies yields the cosmic evolution equations,

$$\frac{3}{a^2}\left(H^2 + \kappa\right) - m^2\sin^2\theta\left[\beta_0 + 3\beta_1 y + 3\beta_2 y^2 + \beta_3 y^3\right] = \frac{\rho}{M_g^2}, \tag{8a}$$

$$\frac{3}{b^2}\left(J^2/\tilde c^2 + \kappa\right) - m^2\cos^2\theta\left[\beta_1 y^{-3} + 3\beta_2 y^{-2} + 3\beta_3 y^{-1} + \beta_4\right] = 0. \tag{8b}$$

[1] The reference metric $\tilde g$ could, in principle, contain an off-diagonal term $D(\eta)\,{\rm d}r\,{\rm d}\eta$; however, explicit calculations show that physically meaningful solutions always imply $D = 0$. [23] Thus, we disregard such a term altogether.

Here, a prime denotes a derivative by η, $y = b/a$, and $H = a'/a$ as well as $J = b'/b$ are the Hubble parameters for both metrics in conformal time.

Moreover, Eqs. (6) imply that $\rho' = 3H(1+\omega)\rho$ and

$$(\tilde{c}H - J)\underbrace{\left[\beta_1 y + 2\beta_2 y^2 + \beta_3 y^3\right]}_{\equiv\Gamma(y)} = 0, \tag{9}$$

for a perfect fluid with equation of state $P = \omega\rho$. It has been shown that only the vanishing of the round brackets yields a physically meaningful solution, as in the other case the graviton mass turns out to be zero. Thus, the missing degree of freedom will re-enter only at the non-perturbative level in the form of a ghost [22]. Thus, we find $J(\eta) = \tilde{c}(\eta)H(\eta)$.

Using this result, we can derive an algebraic equation for y, by subtracting Eq. (8a) from Eq. (8b),

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_1\cos^2\theta y^{-1} + (3\beta_2\cos^2\theta - \beta_0\sin^2\theta) + \\ +(3\beta_3\cos^2\theta - 3\beta_1\sin^2\theta)y + \\ +(\beta_4\cos^2\theta - 3\beta_2\sin^2\theta)y^2 - \beta_3\sin^2\theta y^3 = \frac{\rho}{M_g^2 m^2}.\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

By assumption, ρ is the density of a perfect fluid with $\omega \geq -1$, which behaves as [22]

$$\rho(\eta) = \rho_0 \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \omega = -1, \\ \left(\frac{a(\eta)}{a(\eta_0)}\right)^{-3(1+\omega)} & \text{if } \omega > -1, \end{cases} \tag{11}$$

such that any fluid of type $\omega > -1$ is diluted, i.e. $\rho \to 0$ for $\eta \to \infty$. It is in fact sufficient to consider such densities, since any cosmological constant (CC) type of energy density may be included in the interaction terms of the bigravity theory.

In this limit, we denote the solution of Eq. (10) as y_*. An exact expression is in principle feasible, however not very enlightening. Therefore, and since we are interested in late times, we linearize Eq. (10) around y_* and obtain for $y = y_* + \delta y$,

$$\delta y(\eta) = -\frac{\rho(\eta)}{3m^2 M_g^2}\frac{y_*^3}{\Gamma_*(\cos^2\theta + y_*^2\sin^2\theta) - 2\frac{\rho_f^* y_*^4}{3m^2 M_f^2}}, \tag{12}$$

with the short-hand notation $\Gamma_* = \Gamma(y_*)$ and $\rho_f^* = M_f^2 m^2\cos^2\theta\left(\beta_1 y_*^{-3} + 3\beta_2 y_*^{-2} + 3\beta_3 y_*^{-1} + \beta_4\right)$.

This manipulation allows us to rewrite Eq. (8a) as

$$a(\eta)^{-2}(H(\eta)^2 + \kappa) = \frac{1}{3}\Lambda + \frac{\rho(\eta)}{3M_{\rm Pl}^2} \tag{13}$$

with the cosmological constant $\Lambda \equiv m^2\sin^2\theta\left(\beta_0 + 3\beta_1 y_* + 3\beta_2 y_*^2 + \beta_3 y_*^3\right)$ and the physical Planck mass,

$$M_{\rm Pl}^2 = M_g^2\frac{\cos^2\theta + y_*^2\sin^2\theta - \frac{2\rho_f^* y_*^4}{3m^2 M_f^2\Gamma_*}}{\cos^2\theta - \frac{2\rho_f^* y_*^4}{3m^2 M_f^2\Gamma_*}}, \tag{14}$$

which approaches $M_g^2\left(1 + y_*^2\tan^2\theta\right)$, as $\rho_f^* \to 0$, in agreement with [19, 20].

Finally, we may use that $y' = \left(\frac{b}{a}\right)' = y(J - H)$ and $J = \tilde{c}\,H$ to find that,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{c}(\eta) =& 1 + \frac{y'}{yH} \simeq 1 + \frac{\delta y'}{y_* H} \\ \simeq& 1 - (1+\omega)\frac{\rho(\eta)}{m^2\Gamma_* M_{\rm Pl}^2}\frac{y_*^2}{\cos^2\theta - \frac{2\rho_f^* y_*^4}{3m^2 M_f^2\Gamma_*}}.\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

As evident from Eq. (15), we can take $\tilde{c} = 1$ to a good approximation. This motivates the limit where y takes the constant value y_*, which we apply in the following.

At this point, we would like to point out that this phenomenon has previously been studied in [19, 20]. However, the authors find that the modification of the GR prediction is proportional to $\tilde{c} - 1$. Firstly, this implies that the massive mode propagates at a velocity larger than the speed of light (note that we have found $\tilde{c} \leq 1$ above). Secondly, as we will outline in the next section, GW oscillations do not require $\tilde{c} \neq 1$. Instead, we find that oscillations occur even in flat space with $\tilde{c} = 1$. Both are physically sensible outcomes.

B. Gravitational wave oscillations

We now address the propagation of tensor perturbations around the background metric.[2] Defining the transverse traceless components,

$$\delta g_{ij} = a^2(h_+\epsilon_{ij}^+ + h_\times\epsilon_{ij}^\times), \tag{16a}$$

$$\delta\tilde{g}_{ij} = b^2(\tilde{h}_+\epsilon_{ij}^+ + \tilde{h}_\times\epsilon_{ij}^\times), \tag{16b}$$

the equations of motion are given by [25]

$$h'' + 2\,Hh' + k^2 h + \sin^2\theta\, m^2\,\Gamma_* a^2(h - \tilde{h}) = 0, \tag{17a}$$

$$\tilde{h}'' + 2\,H\tilde{h}' + k^2\tilde{h} + \cos^2\theta\,\frac{m^2\,\Gamma_*}{y_*^2}a^2(\tilde{h} - h) = 0, \tag{17b}$$

where $k = |\vec{k}|$ denotes the three-momentum and the polarisation indices $+/\times$ have been dropped. For the linear combinations

$$h_1 \equiv \cos^2\theta\, h + \sin^2\theta\, y_*^2\,\tilde{h}, \quad h_2 \equiv h - y_*^2\,\tilde{h}, \tag{18}$$

one of the equations decouples and we obtain

$$h_1'' + 2\,Hh_1' + k^2 h_1 = 0, \tag{19a}$$

$$h_2'' + 2\,Hh_2' + k^2 h_2 + a^2 m_g^2\, h_2 = a^2 m_g^2\kappa(\theta, y_*)h_1, \tag{19b}$$

[2] The scalar mode couples to the trace of a conserved source and will thus in principle be excited, too. However, it is suppressed due to the Vainshtein effect [24].

where we have defined the physical graviton mass $m_g^2 \equiv m^2\Gamma_*(\sin^2\theta + \frac{\cos^2\theta}{y_*^2})$, and the source term is proportional to $\kappa(\theta, y_*) \equiv \left(\frac{1-y_*^2}{\cos^2\theta + y_*^2\sin^2\theta}\right)$. We observe that Eqs. (19) comprise one massless and one massive propagating tensor perturbation, where the latter is sourced by the former. Ignoring the Hubble rate, which is typically much smaller than the wave numbers k under consideration, and setting the expansion rate to a constant $a = 1$, we can solve these equations and rotate back to the physical basis,

$$h(t,k) = \frac{\cos^2\theta\cos(k\,t) + y_*^2\sin^2\theta\cos\left(\sqrt{k^2+m_g^2}\,t\right)}{\cos^2\theta + y_*^2\sin^2\theta}, \tag{20a}$$

$$\tilde{h}(t,k) = \frac{\cos^2\theta\cos(k\,t) - \cos^2\theta\cos\left(\sqrt{k^2+m_g^2}\,t\right)}{\cos^2\theta + y_*^2\sin^2\theta} \tag{20b}$$

where η has been replaced by cosmic time t as per $a = 1$.

Since the graviton mass is restricted to be much smaller than the typical wave number k, we may expand $\sqrt{k^2+m_g^2} \simeq k\left[1 + m_g^2/(2k^2)\right] \equiv \omega_0 + \delta\omega$. We see that the function in Eq. (20a) is minimized when the second cosine acquires a total phase shift of $\delta\omega\, T_*\,\pi$, and thus,

$$T_*(\omega_0) = \frac{2\pi\,\omega_0}{m_g^2}\,, \tag{21}$$

which coincides with the expression for the oscillation length for neutrinos, confirming our naïve expectation.

In order to make a quantitative statement about the modulation of the strain observed in GW observations, we average this expression over a timescale T, which is bigger than the period of one massless mode's inverse frequency, $T_0 = \frac{2\pi}{\omega_0}$, but much smaller than the period of the modulation induced by the mass term, $T_* = \frac{\pi}{\delta\omega}$. Squaring the strain, we find the envelope function

$$\left\langle h^2(t,k)\right\rangle_{T_0 \ll T \ll T_*} = \frac{\cos^4\theta}{\left(\cos^2\theta + y_*^2\sin^2\theta\right)^2}\left[1 + 2\,y_*^2\,\tan^2\theta\,\cos(\delta\omega\,T) + y_*^4\tan^4\theta\right], \tag{22}$$

where the normalization is determined by the condition $\left\langle h^2(t,k)\right\rangle\big|_{T=0} = 1$, i.e. initially a pure perturbation of the physical metric has been excited.

Finally, we aim to express the strain in terms of the cosmic redshift z, which is defined as $1 + z = a(t_0)/a(t)$. For a universe dominated by a cosmological constant, we find that $H = \text{const.}$ and $a(t) = e^{Ht}$. We therefore express the time as,[3]

$$t = -\frac{1}{H}\log(1+z). \tag{23}$$

In summary, the squared amplitude of the GW signal in bigravity is modulated as

$$\left\langle h^2(t,k)\right\rangle_{T_0 \ll T \ll T_*} = \frac{\cos^4\theta}{\left(\cos^2\theta + y_*^2\sin^2\theta\right)^2}\left[1 + y_*^4\tan^4\theta + 2\,y_*^2\tan^2\theta\,\cos\left(\frac{\delta\omega}{H}\,\log(1+z)\right)\right]. \tag{24}$$

C. Phenomenology

Given that we have reached a quantitative understanding of GW oscillations in terms of the modulation (24), we now ask whether this effect is visible in realistic scenarios. To this end, we have made use of the available data for the events GW150914 [26] and GW151226 [27] obtained by means of numerical simulations [28–39]. This yields the strain as it would be observed in a detector on Earth. We then modulate the strain according to Eq. (24). Two such examples for GW150914 are shown in Fig. 1, where the parameters are chosen such that one obtains a maximally visible effect, i.e. $\theta = \pi/4$ and $y_* = 1$. One observes that a graviton mass of $m_g = 10^{-22}\,\text{eV}$ strongly changes the shape of the signal, where the modulation is at first strongly suppressing the amplitude and then gradually approaching the GR amplitude towards the typical merger peak, commonly referred to as *chirp*. On the other hand, a larger graviton mass $m_g = 10^{-19}\,\text{eV}$ leads to a global suppression of the amplitude by a constant factor. This effect is similar to the decoherence of oscillating neutrino wave packets and we will now briefly discuss this effect.

The massive and the massless modes propagate in wave packets with different group velocities $v_g = \frac{\partial\omega}{\partial k}$. As for very light, relativistic neutrinos, the difference of group velocities is approximately given by $\Delta v_g \simeq \frac{m_g^2}{2E^2}$. The

[3] Note that we have reinstated $a(t) \neq \text{const.}$ in conflict with the condition $a = 1$ used in the analytic derivation of Eq. (22). Thus Eq. (24) is only a valid approximation for small z.



(a) $m_g = 10^{-22}$ eV (b) $m_g = 10^{-19}$ eV

Figure 1: Bigravity vs. GR: simulated strain in the detector due to gravitational waves as emitted by the black hole merger event GW150914, as observed by LIGO. The dashed orange curve shows the results in GR, while the blue curve is obtained by multiplying with the frequency-dependent modulation due to bigravity. Note the constant suppression in panel (b).

wave packets will de-cohere, i.e. interference will be absent and the frequency dependence of the suppression is lost in favor of a constant reduction, once the time of propagation exceeds $T_{\rm coh} = L_{\rm coh}/c$, given by [40]

$$T_{\rm coh}\, \Delta v_g \sim \sigma_x\,, \tag{25}$$

where σ_x is the spatial/temporal width of the wave packet. Since its determination would involve an exact solution of the full set of Einstein equations for the system, it will be practically impossible to obtain σ_x. However, from the shape of the signal, we estimate that $\sigma_x \sim 0.1\,$s. Therefore, we find that for $E/\hbar \sim 100\,$Hz,

$$L_{\rm coh} \sim 0.1\,{\rm s}\,\frac{2E^2}{m_g^2} = \left(\frac{10^{-21}\,{\rm eV}}{m_g}\right)^2 {\rm Gpc}\,. \tag{26}$$

This rather heuristic argument is, nevertheless in good agreement with Fig. 3, where for $m_g = 10^{-22}\,$eV no averaging is observable at distances of the order 100 Mpc, while for $m_g = 5\cdot 10^{-22}\,$eV, or even $m_g = 10^{-19}\,$eV, the amplitude levels out for distances below the Gpc scale.

Once the distance increases beyond the scale set by $L_{\rm coh}$, the strain suppression relative to the prediction of General Relativity caused by oscillations levels out. E.g. for $y_* = 1$, $\theta = \pi/4$ we find

$$\langle h(t,k)\rangle_{T\gg T_{\rm coh}} = \left\langle \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}\left[1+\cos\left(\delta\omega\, t\right)\right]}\right\rangle_{T\gg T_{\rm coh}} = \frac{2}{\pi}, \tag{27}$$

which predicts a suppression factor constant in frequency and distance of about 64 % at large redshifts, which is clearly confirmed in Fig. 3.

Note that higher graviton masses lead to shorter length scales before the amplitude averages out, in complete analogy to neutrino oscillations. In practice, such a frequency-independent suppression is indistinguishable from ordinary GW of General Relativity and would be interpreted as a larger redshift, i.e. one would generally *overestimate* the redshift on such BBH merger events. If a larger set of events becomes available, this can be used to constrain the larger-graviton mass regime by comparing expected distribution of BBH systems with the observed event rates.

For the low-mass regime, we can constrain the parameters of the model by demanding that the waveform be in agreement with the error bars of the observed events. We have used a simple χ^2-analysis to obtain Fig. 2, where we have set $y_* = 1$.[4] This categorizes the effect of bigravity into three classes. For very small m_g, or $\theta \approx 0$



Figure 2: Excluded parameter space due to a simplified wave form analysis as discussed in the main text.

[4] Note that a value of y_* different than $y_* = \pm 1$ would simply reduce the modulation and is therefore equivalent to a smaller mixing angle.



(a) Variable m_g for $\theta = \frac{\pi}{4}$, $y_* = 1$.

(b) Variable θ for $m_g = 10^{-22}$ eV, $y_* = 1$.

Figure 3: Average suppression of a GW150914-like strain as a function of the redshift for different sets of the parameters m_g and θ. Note that, in the left panel, for large m_g and redshift the suppression levels out at $\sim 64\%$ as discussed in the main text. The right panel illustrates that the mixing angle θ determines the average level of reduction of the strain relative to GR at large distances.

or $\pi/2$, the suppression vanishes. Alternatively, if the distance lies beyond the scale set by $\delta\omega$, i.e. T_*, the suppression is constant in frequency and any event is indistinguishable from an equivalent event within pure GR at larger z. From the remaining events, where the waveform of the bigravity-suppressed strain is clearly distinguishable from the GR strain, we draw our conclusions on the excluded parameter space. From Fig. 2 we find that, first of all, the event GW150914 gives stronger constraints than the second event GW151226. But even with only one observation, we find that for large enough mixing angles we may exclude values of $m_g \gtrsim 10^{-22}$ eV, comparable to the bounds set by GW150914 via a modified dispersion relation [21]. Additionally we have adopted the model independent bound, which reads $7.2 \cdot 10^{-23}$ eV [41] to the present case by multiplying the mass with a factor $\sin\theta$ to account for the bigravity modification of the classical Newtonian potential, see e.g. [42]. We find that GW oscillations give stronger constraints for smaller mixing angles, where the Yukawa bound quickly becomes weaker. We conclude that with more events available and higher precision, GW oscillations offer excellent prospects to probe the bigravity parameter space.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

We have studied the oscillatory behavior of gravitational waves in the framework of bigravity, where one massive and one massless mode propagate. In full analogy to neutrino oscillations, we have seen that a non-diagonal coupling of the two modes to matter gives rise to potentially significant modulations of the strain that would be observable e.g. in the LIGO or LISA detectors. Using the first ever detected gravitational wave signals GW150914 and GW151226, we illustrated that the bigravity modification of General Relativity can lead to drastic modulations of the strain compared to the predictions of Einstein gravity. Using this, we have constrained the parameter space of the model in the low-mass regime, and pointed out that, once more events are available, the high-mass regime can be constrained, too.

In this letter, we have not used exact, numerical results but instead made several approximations and assumptions in order to be able to give compact analytic expressions that allow the reader to understand the mechanisms behind gravitational wave oscillations. Nevertheless, the fully general results are straight forwardly obtained by following our approach such that future analyses may directly use the results of this work.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank Evgeny Akhmedov for very useful discussions on the fundamentals of neutrino oscillations. MP is supported by IMPRS-PTFS.

[1] M. Fierz and W. Pauli, Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. **A173**, 211 (1939).
[2] M. Fierz, Helv. Phys. Acta **12**, 3 (1939).
[3] H. van Dam and M. J. G. Veltman, Nucl. Phys. **B22**, 397 (1970).
[4] V. I. Zakharov, JETP Lett. **12**, 312 (1970), [Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.12,447(1970)].
[5] A. I. Vainshtein, Phys. Lett. **B39**, 393 (1972).
[6] D. G. Boulware and S. Deser, Phys. Rev. **D6**, 3368 (1972).
[7] C. de Rham and G. Gabadadze, Phys. Rev. **D82**, 044020 (2010), arXiv:1007.0443 [hep-th].
[8] C. de Rham, G. Gabadadze, and A. J. Tolley, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 231101 (2011), arXiv:1011.1232 [hep-th].
[9] C. de Rham, G. Gabadadze, and A. J. Tolley, Phys. Lett. **B711**, 190 (2012), arXiv:1107.3820 [hep-th].
[10] S. F. Hassan and R. A. Rosen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 041101 (2012), arXiv:1106.3344 [hep-th].
[11] S. F. Hassan and R. A. Rosen, JHEP **07**, 009 (2011), arXiv:1103.6055 [hep-th].
[12] S. F. Hassan, R. A. Rosen, and A. Schmidt-May, JHEP **02**, 026 (2012), arXiv:1109.3230 [hep-th].
[13] D. Comelli, M. Crisostomi, F. Nesti, and L. Pilo, Phys. Rev. **D86**, 101502 (2012), arXiv:1204.1027 [hep-th].
[14] C. Deffayet, J. Mourad, and G. Zahariade, JCAP **1301**, 032 (2013), arXiv:1207.6338 [hep-th].
[15] C. Deffayet, J. Mourad, and G. Zahariade, JHEP **03**, 086 (2013), arXiv:1208.4493 [gr-qc].
[16] S. F. Hassan and R. A. Rosen, JHEP **02**, 126 (2012), arXiv:1109.3515 [hep-th].
[17] S. F. Hassan and R. A. Rosen, JHEP **04**, 123 (2012), arXiv:1111.2070 [hep-th].
[18] C. de Rham, L. Heisenberg, and R. H. Ribeiro, Phys. Rev. **D90**, 124042 (2014), arXiv:1409.3834 [hep-th].
[19] A. De Felice, T. Nakamura, and T. Tanaka, Progress of Theoretical and Experimental Physics **2014**, 1 (2014).
[20] T. Narikawa, K. Ueno, H. Tagoshi, T. Tanaka, N. Kanda, and T. Nakamura, Phys. Rev. **D91**, 062007 (2015), arXiv:1412.8074 [gr-qc].
[21] B. P. Abbott *et al.* (Virgo, LIGO Scientific), Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 061102 (2016), arXiv:1602.03837 [gr-qc].
[22] M. von Strauss, A. Schmidt-May, J. Enander, E. Mortsell, and S. F. Hassan, JCAP **1203**, 042 (2012), arXiv:1111.1655 [gr-qc].
[23] D. Comelli, M. Crisostomi, F. Nesti, and L. Pilo, JHEP **03**, 067 (2012), [Erratum: JHEP06,020(2012)], arXiv:1111.1983 [hep-th].
[24] C. de Rham, , 1 (2014).
[25] D. Comelli, M. Crisostomi, and L. Pilo, JHEP **06**, 085 (2012), arXiv:1202.1986 [hep-th].
[26] B. Abbott *et al.* (Virgo, LIGO Scientific), Phys. Rev. **X6**, 041014 (2016), arXiv:1606.01210 [gr-qc].
[27] B. P. Abbott *et al.* (Virgo, LIGO Scientific), Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 241103 (2016), arXiv:1606.04855 [gr-qc].
[28] B. Wardell, I. Hinder, and E. Bentivegna, "Simulation of GW150914 binary black hole merger using the Einstein Toolkit," (2016).
[29] F. Loffler *et al.*, Class. Quant. Grav. **29**, 115001 (2012), arXiv:1111.3344 [gr-qc].
[30] D. Pollney, C. Reisswig, E. Schnetter, N. Dorband, and P. Diener, Phys. Rev. **D83**, 044045 (2011), arXiv:0910.3803 [gr-qc].
[31] E. Schnetter, S. H. Hawley, and I. Hawke, Class. Quant. Grav. **21**, 1465 (2004), arXiv:gr-qc/0310042 [gr-qc].
[32] J. Thornburg, Class. Quant. Grav. **21**, 743 (2004), arXiv:gr-qc/0306056 [gr-qc].
[33] M. Ansorg, B. Bruegmann, and W. Tichy, Phys. Rev. **D70**, 064011 (2004), arXiv:gr-qc/0404056 [gr-qc].
[34] O. Dreyer, B. Krishnan, D. Shoemaker, and E. Schnetter, Phys. Rev. **D67**, 024018 (2003), arXiv:gr-qc/0206008 [gr-qc].
[35] T. Goodale, G. Allen, G. Lanfermann, J. Massó, T. Radke, E. Seidel, and J. Shalf, in *Vector and Parallel Processing – VECPAR'2002, 5th International Conference, Lecture Notes in Computer Science* (Springer, Berlin, 2003).
[36] J. D. Brown, P. Diener, O. Sarbach, E. Schnetter, and M. Tiglio, Phys. Rev. **D79**, 044023 (2009), arXiv:0809.3533 [gr-qc].
[37] S. Husa, I. Hinder, and C. Lechner, Comput. Phys. Commun. **174**, 983 (2006), arXiv:gr-qc/0404023.
[38] M. Thomas and E. Schnetter, in *Grid Computing (GRID), 2010 11th IEEE/ACM International Conference on* (2010) pp. 369 –378, arXiv:1008.4571 [cs.DC].
[39] `http://www.black-holes.org/waveforms`, catalog entry SXS:BBH:0317 for GW151226.
[40] M. Beuthe, Phys. Rept. **375**, 105 (2003), arXiv:hep-ph/0109119 [hep-ph].
[41] C. de Rham, J. T. Deskins, A. J. Tolley, and S.-Y. Zhou, (2016), arXiv:1606.08462 [astro-ph.CO].
[42] M. Platscher and J. Smirnov, (2016), arXiv:1611.09385 [gr-qc].